UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,797	04/15/2004	Masayuki Satake	UNIU79.023AUS 6655	
	7590 09/06/200 RTENS OLSON & BE	EXAMINER		
2040 MAIN ST	REET	BASHORE, ALAIN L		
FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/06/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/824,797	SATAKE ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Alain L. Bashore	1762			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we tee to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Au	<u>ıgust 2007</u> .	·			
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 9 and 22-34 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 22-34 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the GReplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment	t(s)	·				
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/824,797

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 9, 18-29, 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukunoki in view of Kim Jong Eun et al (KR- 2004-0020085) further in view of Mikura.

Mukunoki discloses an antistatic layer laminated on and in contact with at least one side of the optical film (may be on the surface layer or the inner layer, column 12, lines 39-40), wherein the antistatic layer comprises a water soluble or a water dispersible conductive polymer, such as polyaniline and polythiophene (column 12, lines 46-53) as defined by Applicant's specification (original claim 2). Mukunoki teaches that the antistatic layer has a surface resistance value as claimed by applicant (column 12, lines 39-42). The optical film comprises a polarizing plate (column 12, lines 31-35, film, column 19, lines 35-40), and that an activation treatment is given to the optical film (surface treatment to improve adhesion, column 12, lines 3-10).

Mukunoki fails to teach a method of manufacturing the antistatic optical film comprising the steps of applying an aqueous solution or an aqueous dispersion comprising the water soluble or water dispersible conductive polymer on the optical film; and drying to form the antistatic layer; let alone that the water dispersible polymer is constituted by micro-particles having a size of 1 micrometer or less.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a size of one micrometer or lass because such dimensions are well known for optical coatings per-se and because the described optical result would depend in part on coating thicknesses.

Application/Control Number: 10/824,797

Art Unit: 1762

However, Kim Jong Eun et al (KR- 2004-0020085) teaches a method comprising the steps of applying an aqueous dispersion of polythiophene on LCD cells the optical film (polyethyleneand drying to form the antistatic layer (see abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have manufactured the optical film of Mukunoki, by a method comprising the steps of applying an aqueous solution or an aqueous dispersion comprising the water soluble or water dispersible conductive polymer on the optical film; and drying to form the antistatic layer; in order to provide the desired coating properties, as taught by the Korean reference to Kin Jong Eun et al.

Mukunoki fails to teaches that the adhesive layer is pressure sensitive, let alone that it is acrylic.

However, Mikura teaches that it is well known in the prior art to use an acrylic pressure-sensitive adhesive layer on an optical base film to attach to a liquid crystal cell, for the purpose improving the efficiency of the display assembling and preventing the occurrence of dispersion of quality (column 1, lines 14-24).

Art Unit: 1762

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used an the adhesive layer laminated on another side of a surface having the optical film of the antistatic layer of Mukunoki, in order to improve the efficiency of the display assembly and to prevent any dispersion in display quality, as taught by Mikura.

Regarding claim 26, Mukunoki fails to that a surface material of the optical film on which the antistatic layer is laminated is a polycarbonate.

However, Mikura teaches that a transparent protective layer excellent in transparency (column 3, lines 65-67), mechanical strength, heat stability and moisture-shielding property is made from polycarbonate (column 4, lines 1-5) for the purpose of providing the desired properties.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used a polycarbonate as the surface material of the optical film of Mukunoki, in order to provide the desired mechanical strength, heat stability and moisture-shielding property, as taught by Mikura.

Regarding claims 32 and 33, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include such recitations because what is claimed are common in the LCD art per se.

Application/Control Number: 10/824,797

Art Unit: 1762

3. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukunoki in view of (Kim Jong Eun et al (KR- 2004-0020085)) further in view of Mikura as applied to claims above, and further in view of the admitted prior art and Abe et al.

The admitted prior art discloses that it is known to comprise a polarizing plate of a polarized element and another element (page 1), where other elements include transparent protective films (page 2).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a polarized element and transparent protective film as a polarizing plate because the admitted prior art teaches surface protective films as attached to optical elements.

The admitted prior art does not teach a material for the film as further claimed in claim 30.

Abe et al discloses a styrene type polymer (para 0028).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include such because Abe et al teaches a protective film composition for LCDs.

Regarding claim 31, the admitted prior art discloses that it is known that retardation plates require protection (page 1).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include the optical film as a retardation plate because the admitted prior art teaches that retardation plates require protection (page 1).

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 571-272-6739. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Mon. thru Thurs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/824,797 Page 8

Art Unit: 1762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alain L. Bashore/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1762